UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,704	05/23/2001	Lakshmi Arunachalam	002435.P002X	1786

7590 12/06/2005

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2151	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/863,704	ARUNACHALAM, LAKSHMI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed on September 22, 2005.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 22, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Objections

3. In response to amendments made to claim 26 to correct minor informalities, Examiner has withdrawn the objection to claim 26.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed September 22, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Page does not teach or suggest either:

a) A network transaction portal; or,

b) Controlling a transaction from a network transaction portal.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion.

5. Regarding item a), Examiner submits, in giving broadest reasonable interpretation to the claimed invention, Examiner has interpreted Applicant's network transaction portal as the service broker taught by Page. It is clear in the teachings of Page that similar to Applicant's claimed network transaction portal, the service broker taught by Page receives a request for a service transaction involving a plurality of service providers (col. 3, lines 36-42, Fig. 6, Fig. 7g, Fig. 8), and also manages the service transaction (col. 3, lines 42-45).

6. Regarding item b), Examiner has previously acknowledged Page fails to expressly disclose controlling a transaction from the network transaction portal. Nevertheless, as previously indicated, Page does teach the network transaction portal managing the transaction (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18). Thus, Examiner maintains, if not implicit in the teachings of Page it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Page to show controlling the transaction from the network transaction portal. Doing so would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, Page, col. 3, lines 20-28.

7. Furthermore, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the Examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims1-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page et al. (hereinafter Page), U.S. patent 5,329,619.

10. In considering claims 1 and 7, Page teaches a method and machine-readable medium comprising: Receiving a request for a service transaction involving a plurality of service providers at a network transaction portal, (col. 3, lines 36-42, Fig. 6, Fig. 7g, Fig. 8); remotely executing methods associated with the transaction including routing to a plurality of distributed networked software objects containing methods associated with the transaction via at least one link through a common network application functionally interposed between a client network access device and the plurality of networked software objects that controls the transaction, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

Although the teachings of Page show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the network transaction portal controlling the transaction.

Nevertheless, Page does show: the network transaction portal managing the transaction, (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Page to show controlling the transaction from the network transaction portal. This would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, Page, col. 3, lines 20-28.

11. In considering claims 2 and 8, Page further teaches the transaction including communicating with a virtual information store via a network protocol to determine a network address for a networked object, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

12. In considering claims 3 and 9, Page further teaches the transaction including using a stub object to enable remote execution of a method of a corresponding skeleton object that is associated with the transaction, (col. 14, lines 30-65).

13. In considering claim 4, Page teaches using the stub object to interact with a networked object of a first service provider and a networked object of a second provider, (col. 14, lines 30-65).

14. In considering claim 5, Page teaches the stub object created in real-time using a meta-compiler and transmitting the stub object to the network transaction portal, (col. 14, lines 30-65).

15. In considering claims 6 and 10, Page teaches an N-way interactive transaction among an integer plurality N of service providers, (col. 52, lines 46-52).

16. In considering claim 11, Page teaches a method comprising: Receiving a request at a network transaction portal for a transaction on a service network from a client access device, the service network including a first service provider and a second

service provider, (col. 3, lines 36-42); registering with an object router that routes to remote networked software objects associated with the transaction, creating links between the client access device and a plurality of nodes each having an object associated with the transaction via the network transaction portal that is functionally interposed between the client access device and the plurality of nodes by routing to the object of each node, remotely executing methods associated with each software object, and receiving transaction results, (col. 3, lines 31-61).

Although the teachings of Page show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: controlled links.

Nevertheless, Page does show: the network transaction portal managing the transaction, (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Page to show controlled links between the client access device and a plurality of nodes. This would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, Page, col. 3, lines 20-28.

17. In considering claim 12, Page teaches using an application-accessible virtual information store that contains object identification and a network address assigned to

each object to determine the network address of each object and route to the network address, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

18. In considering claim 13, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that the virtual information store includes using a distributed on-line service information base (DOLSIB), (col. 3, lines 55-61).

19. In considering claim 14, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that the network software object is accessed at the obtained network address, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

20. In considering claim 15, Page further teaches using a stub object that allows remote execution of a method of a corresponding skeleton object that is the object at the node, (col. 14, lines 30-65).

21. In considering claim 16, Page teaches returning the transaction results to the client access device via the network transaction portal, (col. 3, lines 36-42).

22. In considering claim 17, the teachings of Page provide a means for executing a transaction involving a plurality of distributed networked objects associated with service methods of each of a plurality of service providers by routing to each of the plurality of distributed networked objects via a common network application at the network transaction portal that controls the transaction, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

23. In considering claim 18, Page teaches a system comprising: An interface of a network transaction portal to a client network access device to receive a request for a transaction from the access device, (col. 3, lines 36-42, Fig. 6, Fig. 7g, Fig. 8); and a transactional application of the network transaction portal corresponding to the transaction, the transactional application functionally interposed between the client network access device and a plurality of service providers corresponding to the transaction to access to and remotely execute methods associated with networked objects associated with the service providers, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

Although the teachings of Page show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the network transaction portal controlling the transaction.

Nevertheless, Page does show: the network transaction portal managing the transaction, (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Page to show controlling the transaction from the network transaction portal. This would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, Page, col. 3, lines 20-28.

24. In considering claim 19, Page further teaches the transactional application including a router that uses a DOLSIB to route to a plurality of distributed networked objects each having a method associated with the transaction, (col. 3, lines 55-61).

25. In considering claim 20, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that a switch in an application layer of a layered network communications model switches to the transactional application after receiving the request, (col. 3, lines 36-48).

26. In considering claim 21, Page teaches a remote object associated with the transaction functionally interposed between the network transaction portal and an enterprise computer system of a service provider participant to interface with the enterprise computer system and utilize data of the enterprise computer system in a method, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

27. In considering claim 22, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that the distributed objects include object-oriented software objects, (col. 3, lines 31-36).

28. In considering claim 23, Page teaches a stub object corresponding to the geographically distributed objects to allow remote access to the geographically distributed objects, (col. 14, lines 30-65).

29. In considering claim 24, Page teaches a system comprising: A server to store software and to execute software instructions, a network transaction portal, a service involving a plurality of service providers, and routing a plurality of objects associated with the plurality of service providers, (col. 3, lines 31-48).

Although the teachings of Page show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the network transaction portal controlling the transaction.

Nevertheless, Page does show: the network transaction portal managing the transaction, (col. 3, lines 42-45). Page also shows a client choosing the option of having control being passed back from a network transaction portal, depending on the clients preference in processing, (col. 9, line 34, through col. 10, line 18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Page, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Page to show controlling the transaction from the network transaction portal. This would have further facilitated service transactions in a network involving a plurality of service providers, Page, col. 3, lines 20-28.

30. In considering claim 25, the teachings of Page provide a means for the network transaction portal means including a network application and wherein the network transaction portal means is a network transaction portal means to route via a at least one controlled link through a common network application, (col. 3, lines 42-48).

31. In considering claim 26, it is implicit in the teachings of Page that each object comprises an extended finite state machine, and further comprising transitioning a state of an object, (col. 3, lines 31-61).

32. In considering claim 27, the teachings of Page provide a means for controlling and managing cooperation and interaction among the service providers including selectively routing to and involving the service providers in the transaction, (col. 3, lines 36-42).

Conclusion

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
12/2/05

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER